



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/510,379	10/05/2004	Xaver Bachmeir	4100-353PUS	6221
7590 Thomas C Pontani Cohen Pontani Lieberman & Pavane 551 Fifth Avenue Suite 1210 New York, NY 10176			EXAMINER HINZE, LEO T	
			ART UNIT 2854	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	01/03/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/510,379	BACHMEIR ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Leo T. Hinze	2854	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 October 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 12-17 and 19-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 12-17 and 19-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 25 October 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

Art Unit: 2854

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 12-15, 17, 19, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarda, US 4,889,051 (hereafter Sarda) in view of Rendelmann et al., US 6,435,086 (hereafter Rendelmann) and Dillig et al., US 6,024,015 (hereafter Dillig).

- a. Regarding claim 12:

Sarda teaches an inking unit for a printing unit of a rotary printing press, said inking unit being removably receivable in the printing unit and comprising side walls, a plurality of rolls

Art Unit: 2854

arranged between said side walls (c. 3, l. 67 - c. 4, l. 4). Sarda also inherently teaches interfaces for at least an ink supply and dampening solution supply, because if the apparatus is to successfully operate as an inking unit and dampening unit, the device must have a supply of ink and dampening solution.

Sarda does not teach a dedicated drive mounted on at least one of said side walls of said inking unit for driving said plurality of rolls; and wherein the interfaces comprise quick-action couplings.

Rendelmann teaches a retractable inking/coating apparatus with a drive (62, Fig. 2) on one of the side walls. The drive is advantageous for driving the rollers synchronously with the plate cylinder (c. 6, ll. 58-59), and can be either a hydraulic or electric drive (c. 6, ll. 62-63).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sarda to include a dedicated drive mounted on at least one of said side walls of said inking unit for driving said plurality of rolls, because Rendelmann teaches that a dedicated drive is advantageous for driving the rollers synchronously with the plate cylinder.

Dillig teaches the use of quick-connect couplings to connect an ink supply (col. 4, l. 60-col. 5, l. 5), because quick connect couplings allow quick and easy connections without the use of tools.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Sarda to include quick-connect couplings, because Dillig teaches that quick-connect couplings are advantageous for making quick and easy connections without requiring the use of tools.

Art Unit: 2854

- b. Regarding claim 13, the combination of Sarda, Rendelmann, and Dillig teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 12 above. Sarda also teaches a damping unit (c. 3, l. 67 - c. 4, l. 4).
- c. Regarding claim 14, the combination of Sarda, Rendelmann, and Dillig teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 13 above. Sarda also teaches wherein said damping unit comprises damping rolls (c. 3, l. 67 - c. 4, l. 4) said dedicated drive is operatively arranged for driving said dampening rolls.
- d. Regarding claim 15, the combination of Sarda, Rendelmann, and Dillig teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 12 above. Sarda also teaches wherein said plurality of rolls comprise one of distributor rolls and applicator rolls (c. 3, l. 67 - c. 4, l. 4).
- e. Regarding claim 17, the combination of Sarda, Rendelmann, and Dillig teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 12 above. The combination would inherently result in an electrical interface for power, because the electric drive motor will require power to operate.
- f. Regarding claim 19, the combination of Sarda, Rendelmann, and Dillig teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 12 above. Rendelmann, as combined with Sarda in claim 12, also teaches a servo drive (c. 6, ll. 62-63).
- g. Regarding claim 21, the combination of Sarda, Rendelmann, and Dillig teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 12 above. Sarda also teaches an inking unit capable of being removed from the printing unit and operated in a further apparatus (Sarda is inherently operable in any GTO Heidelberg press, c. 1, ll. 39-40).

Art Unit: 2854

h. Regarding claim 22, the combination of Sarda, Rendelmann, and Dillig teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 21 above. Sarda also teaches wherein said inking unit is operable in the further apparatus that has compatible mechanical, fluid and electrical connections (Sarda in inherently operable in any GTO Heidelberg press, c. 1, ll. 39-40).

4. Claims 16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarda in view of Rendelmann and Dillig as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Keller, US 5,794,531 (hereafter Keller).

a. Regarding claim 16:

The combination of Sarda, Rendelmann, and Dillig teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 12 above.

The combination of Sarda, Rendelmann, and Dillig does not teach guides and stops, said inking unit configured as a cassette that is insertable into and removable from the printing unit by said guides and positionable in the printing unit using said stops.

Keller teaches guides (432, Fig. 8) and stops (438, Fig. 7), said inking unit configured as a cassette (410, Fig. 7) that is insertable into and removable from the printing unit by said guides and positionable in the printing unit using said stops. This removable inking unit is desirable because it allows easier access to the main cylinders of the printing press (c. 2, ll. 58-60).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Sarda to include guides and stops, said inking unit configured as a cassette that is insertable into and removable from the printing unit by said guides and positionable in the printing unit using said stops as taught by Keller, because Keller

Art Unit: 2854

teaches that such an inking unit is desirable because it allows easier access to the main cylinders of the printing press.

b. Regarding claim 20:

The combination of Sarda, Rendelmann, and Dillig teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 12 above.

The combination of Sarda, Rendelmann, and Dillig does not teach wherein said inking unit is installable in and removable from the printing unit without tools.

Keller teaches guides (432, Fig. 8) and stops (438, Fig. 7), said inking unit configured as a cassette (410, Fig. 7) that is insertable into and removable from the printing unit by said guides and positionable in the printing unit using said stops. A latch (441) is used to secure the inking unit (c. 4, ll. 43-46). This removable inking unit is desirable because it allows easier access to the main cylinders of the printing press (c. 2, ll. 58-60).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Sarda wherein said inking unit is installable in and removable from the printing unit without tools as taught by Keller, because Keller teaches that such an inking unit is desirable because it allows easier access to the main cylinders of the printing press.

#### *Response to Arguments*

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 12-17 and 19-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2854

6. Applicant argues on p. 8 that because Sarda discloses an independent inking device, that Sarda fails to teach or suggest interfaces. Because the inking device is independent, it must inherently have an interface with the rest of the machine in order to properly function with the rest of the machine.

*Conclusion*

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leo T. Hinze whose telephone number is (571) 272-2167. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

Art Unit: 2854

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-2258. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Leo T. Hinze  
Patent Examiner  
AU 2854  
19 December 2006



**REN YAN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**